

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-24 are pending. Claims 2 and 25 to 33 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Claims 19 to 33 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 19 are amended.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2, found allowable. Claim 19 is amended to limit the scope to that of claim 1. Originally, claim 19 allowed for both a pendent photoinitiator and a second, non-polymeric photoinitiator. It is believed the amendment makes the scope clearer and eliminates any ambiguity.

Applicant's Agent thanks Examiner Berman for the opportunity to discuss this proposed amendment and request for rejoinder by telephone on November 8, 2005. At the time, Applicant's Agent suggested a terminal disclaimer to overcome a rejection. Subsequent to the conversation, further review of the rejection and the amendment to claim 1 obviates the need for a terminal disclaimer.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 2005/7070688 (Lewandowski et al.). The rejection is overcome by amendments presented here.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2, found allowable over the reference, therefore the rejection of claims 1, 3-16 and 18 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewandowski et al. has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1, 3-16 and 18 stand provisionally rejected judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patent in view of claims 1 to 22 of Applicant's copending Application No. 10/672,580. This rejection is overcome by amendment of claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 2, found allowable over the reference. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejoinder

Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of method claims 19 to 26 under the procedures of M.P.E.P. 821.04. Claims 19-26, directed to a process, have the same scope and depend from claim 1, believed to be allowable. Claims 27 to 33, directed to an absorbent dressing, are not subject to rejoinder, and have been cancelled.


In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

12/8/2005

By:



Kent S. Kokko, Reg. No.: 33,931
Telephone No.: 651-733-3597

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833